



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

KW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,906	10/25/2001	Hubert Stier	10191/1883	6289

26646 7590 07/30/2003

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

BUI, THACH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,906

Applicant(s)

STIER, HUBERT

Examiner

Thach H Bui

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment filed October 25, 2001 has been received and entered.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is improper. A proper abstract should be in one paragraph form and contains 150 words or less. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As per claim 7, "a connecting part" and "a magnetic restrictor" recited in the claim are not clearly described in the specification. See claim 9 for the informality.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 7-8, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 is vague and indefinite because there is no clear or proper antecedent basis for "the connecting part". There is no clear connection for "the connecting part that is configured as valve seat support"

Claim 11 is vague and indefinite because there is no clear or proper antecedent basis for "the connecting part". See claim 12 for the same informality.

Claim 15 is vague and indefinite because there is no clear or proper antecedent basis for "the magnetic restrictor".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-17, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,844,339) in view of Mesenich (U.S. Patent No. 4,984,549).

Sayer et al. teach a fuel injector comprising a solenoid coil (18); a first and second resetting springs (25, 35); an armature (30) that can be acted upon the solenoid coil; a valve closure member (see Fig. 1); a valve (14) connected to the valve closure

member and including a first limit stop for the armature (33); a valve seat (13); a stationary second limit stop (37). The system includes an external pole (indicated as A) (see Fig. 1) of which cooperate with the armature (30), the armature guide and the stationary second limit stop (37) (see Fig. 1). Furthermore, Sayer et al. disclose a casing formed of a non-magnetic material to enclose the parts of a fuel injector (see Fig. 1). Sayer et al. have all the features of the invention, but failed to teach a needle valve. Mesnich teaches an electromagnetic injection valve comprising a needle valve (33). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sayer et al. to have a needle valve, as taught by Mesenich, to improve the efficiencies of the valve.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Weinand, Vogt et al., Sayer et al. (RE34,945) and Takeda et al. are cited of general interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thach H Bui whose telephone number is 703-305-0063. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-4 p.m.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mar can be reached on 703-308-2087. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/856,906
Art Unit: 3752

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

T.B.
July 25, 2003


MICHAEL MAR 7-25-03
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700